UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/50/498
3 October 1995
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH

Fiftieth session
Agenda item 22

RETURN OR RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY TO THE COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the General Assembly the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the Return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin, in accordance with resolution 48/15 of 2 November 1993.

95-29668 (E) 161095 191095 211095

ANNEX

Report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the action taken by the organization on the return of cultural property to the countries of origin or its restitution in case of illicit appropriation

1. Since the previous report by the Director-General, submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session (A/48/466, annex), the United Nations Educaticnal, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has continued to promote the return of cultural property to the countries of origin as well as its restitution in case of illicit appropriation through the holding, in particular, of the eighth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation. 1/ UNESCO has particularly sought to apply the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation at its eighth session, held at Paris from 24 to 27 May 1994. It will be recalled that these recommendations were based on progress achieved since the first session of the Committee in 1980. This report describes the work of the Committee at its eighth session and the measures taken to implement the recommendations of the Committee at the eighth session. The recommendations adopted by the Committee at the eighth session are contained in appendix I.

I. PROMOTION OF BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE RETURN OR RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

2. The secretariat reported to the Committee on two cases pending before the opening of the eighth session. With respect to the claim by Turkey against Germany for restitution of a sphinx from Boguskoy, negotiations were continuing between the two countries.

3. With regard to the Parthenon Marbles, the United Kingdom authorities had reviewed the matter, but had not modified their position: namely, that the Marbles had been legally acquired and that, as the British Museum was the owner of the Marbles, expropriation would be regarded as confiscatory. The Greek authorities submitted a short history of the issue and disputed the statement that the Marbles had been legally acquired. The British Committee for the Return of the Parthenon Marbles, on being invited to express its views, stated that it was in favour of their return to Greece. The secretariat would seek further information on the legal arguments made by the United Kingdom, with a view to obtaining a more detailed explanation of those aspects which had not previously been before the Committee. Both Greece and the United Kingdom accepted that procedure.

4. No other claims had been brought before the Committee since the previous report. The Committee had not adopted any recommendations regarding cases under negotiation.

5. The authorities of member States informed the Committee of various cases. One such case was that of a donation made to the Polish State and deposited in the Museum of Lviv, a city that was no longer on Polish territory, others being the case of the Metropolitan Museum (New York), which had returned the Lydian Hoard, and that of the donation by the Brooklyn Museum (New York) of a Roman sarcophagus stolen from Turkey in 1986 to an American-Turkish foundation, which would return it to Turkey after two years. The Guatemalan and Bolivian authorities also informed the Committee of the excellent cooperation of the Governments of the United States and Canada in certain specific cases (case brought by Guatemala before an Illinois court and the textiles from the community of Coroma).

II. INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

6. With regard to international cooperation the secretariat reported on a general study, submitted to the UNESCO Executive Board, on the reinforcement of the action taken by the organization for the protection of cultural heritage. An outline was given of the assistance sought from UNESCO for the protection of cultural property, including movable property, in time of armed conflict, and of current efforts to improve the working of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague Convention of 1954). UNESCO continued to participate in the work of UNIDROIT 2/ on a legal instrument that would complement the 1970 UNESCO Convention by dealing with aspects of private law. Other multilateral efforts to obtain the return of cultural objects, such as the European Union Directive and Regulation and the scheme of the English-speaking countries of the Commonwealth, were described. The secretariat had attended a number of international meetings to broaden knowledge of the Convention and the work of the Committee, and was working in cooperation with other bodies on coordination and the exchange of computerized information on cultural objects.

7. The Italian authorities informed the Committee that Italy was both a country where cultural property was stolen and one in which cultural property acquired illegally was traded. The fight against the illicit traffic in cultural property should take three forms: the improvement of legal protection; the computerized inventorying of cultural property (5 million files were currently available on the Italian heritage); and the creation of operational structures within national police forces. The Italian authorities wanted to see an international fund set up to facilitate the restitution of stolen cultural property. Many speakers, members of the Committee, supported the establishment of such a fund and said that it had already been the subject of an article of the "Arusha Appeal".

8. A number of problems encountered by member States relating to the illicit traffic in cultural property were brought to the Committee's attention. One such case was that of the huge archaeological excavations in Sri Lanka, where clandestine excavators often set to work more quickly than the archaeologists, another being that of the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal, where objects were stolen with a view to illicit export.

9. The Committee's support was sought in order to resolve the problem of the restitution of cultural property to Kuwait in the wake of the Gulf War. The documentation concerning the items had been destroyed, rendering the process of restitution very difficult.

10. The Committee was informed of the situation regarding the illicit traffic in cultural property in Lebanon in the aftermath of 17 years of armed conflict. During a bombardment in 1982, 43 crates of objets d'art belonging to the National Museum of Beirut had been destroyed, and many other items had been stolen and were now on the international art market.

11. With regard to Iraq, the Committee was informed of major thefts from provincial museums. The thefts had been reported in a press release and a notice of stolen objects relating to them was being prepared. The Committee was also informed of the existence of large-scale clandestine excavations in the territory of Iraq.

12. The Committee was informed of the recent successful resolution of cases involving the restitution of cultural property as a result of collaboration between the authorities of the United States and several South American and European countries. Those cases now constituted valuable legal precedents which would be very useful in the future. The Committee was also informed of the agreement reached by the Greek Government with Michael Ward, which would ultimately result in the return of the Aidonian tomb treasure to Greece. The Committee was also briefed on the work done by the United States Information Agency (USIA), which was taking an active role in the prevention of illicit traffic and in the return of property that had entered United States territory illegally. The Committee was given a description of the role played by the State Department, which operated a specialized service acting as intermediary between the various holders of objects (whether institutions or private citizens) and the Governments of the countries in which they had been illicitly acquired.

13. The secretariat of UNIDROIT briefly outlined the background to the draft convention and described the various stages leading up to its adoption. At the request of several countries the UNIDROIT Convention had been translated into Spanish. The UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen and Illegally Exported Cultural Objects was adopted at a diplomatic conference held on 24 June 1995 in Rome, and had already been signed by 11 States.

III. STEPS TO CURB TRAFFIC IN CULTURAL PROPERTY

14. The secretariat informed the Committee that efforts to combat illicit traffic in cultural property had resulted in an increase in the number of States parties to the 1970 Convention from 71 to 81, the distribution of a number of notices concerning stolen cultural property among States parties to the Convention and the holding of regional workshops at Jomtien (Thailand), Keszthély (Hungary) and Arusha (United Republic of Tanzania), and that a national workshop had been held in Phnom Penh. The Committee was also informed that commercial databases were being set up which could be used in the fight against illicit traffic in cultural property.

15. The secretariat also reported on the growing number of international, national and private initiatives to draw up lists of stolen cultural property that might turn up on the international art market. The time had come to set up a central database concerning lost and stolen property, which would benefit all member States.

16. In accordance with the third recommendation adopted by the Committee at its seventh session, ICOM 3/ had, at the secretariat's request, prepared a study concerning the question of inventories in the area of illicit traffic in cultural property. The observer for ICOM gave a brief presentation of the document entitled National Inventories of Cultural Property. The Museum viewpoint. Annexed to the document was a draft form proposed by the International Documentation Committee of ICOM for use when drawing up a computerized list of art objects.

17. The computerized inventory of cultural property stolen in Italy or that might be available on the Italian art market was presented to the Committee. It had been drawn up by the special services of the police force (Carabinieri/Nucleo per la tutela di patrimonio); the system's effectiveness was illustrated by reference to specific cases. The system could be useful to States wishing to equip their own national police forces with modern documentation resources.

18. The Committee was given details about the situation in Ethiopia with regard to the illicit traffic in cultural property. Many objects of great value to Ethiopia's heritage were completely unprotected because they were used in everyday social and religious life. More effective means should be found to coordinate efforts to secure the return and restitution of cultural property. Reference was made to certain Ethiopian items that were currently held abroad, including the royal treasure, the stela of Axum and the famous icon "The stigmata of Christ".

19. The Interpol secretariat informed the Committee of what it was doing to combat illicit traffic in cultural property. It pointed out that Interpol issued regular notices based on its computerized file of stolen property; the latter was updated on the basis of the information received from police forces in its member States. Interpol also organized training courses for police on the prevention of illicit trafficking in cultural property.

20. Prevention and training continued to be very important in the fight against illicit trafficking; that applied to all States, but particularly to the countries of Africa. The situation of Mali in respect of the fight against the illicit traffic in cultural property was very interesting, for Mali was the first State in Africa to have concluded agreements with the United States relating to the importation of cultural property that had been illicitly exported from its country of origin.

21. It was very important to have transit and market States represented on the Committee. It would also be very useful to prepare a multilingual glossary of legal terms to assist the authorities of States preparing new legislation.

22. The Committee adopted a number of recommendations (see appendix I) concerning steps to curb illicit trafficking in cultural property. In accordance with Recommendation I.4, a consultant has been assigned to examine the possibility of establishing a network of databases on cultural objects; he is currently working on this project.

23. In accordance with Recommendation 1.5 (i), the Director-General issued a further appeal to all States to become parties to the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, 1970. The appeal, dated 31 December 1994, was widely distributed; it was also circulated as an information note at the 146th session of the Executive Board.

24. In accordance with Recommendation 1.5 (ii), which called for the promotion of regional conferences on illicit traffic, preparations have been made for a UNESCO/ICOM workshop on illicit traffic in cultural objects in Latin American countries. The workshop which had been scheduled to be held in Cuenca, Ecuador from 6 to 9 February 1995, had to be postponed because of the situation in the country at the time but eventually took place from 10 to 16 September 1995. The draft programme and budget for 1996-1997 includes provision for further regional workshops.

25. In accordance with Recommendation 2, the draft Convention prepared by UNIDROIT, which previously existed only in English and French, these being the two working languages of UNIDROIT, was translated by the UNESCO secretariat into the other four working languages of UNESCO. These texts were provided to UNIDROIT, which was to give them wide distribution, and were also reproduced in document 146 EX/48 which was circulated to all States members of UNESCO. The translations of the final text of the Convention in all six languages of UNESCO is contained in documents 28C/35 and 28C/35 Add. concerning implementation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention considered at the twenty-eighth session of the UNESCO General Conference.

26. In accordance with Recommendation 2.2, the secretariat prepared an analysis of the UNIDROIT draft Convention on the International Return of Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects and the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, showing the similarities and differences between them. This study, which is contained in document 146 EX/48, was distributed to all States members of UNESCO and also to UNIDROIT. It was updated following the adoption of the UNIDROIT Convention (UNESCO document 28C/35 Add.).

27. In accordance with Recommendation 4.1, the secretariat prepared a study of the advantages and disadvantages of export permits; the study, which is contained in annex I to document 146 EX/48, was distributed to States members of UNESCO and also sent to UNIDROIT.

28. Recommendation 5 (5) invited the Director-General to have specialized studies undertaken by archaeologists, conservators, architects, museum experts, dealers, cultural administrators and lawyers in order to clarify issues which are currently disputed or unclear with a view to having such studies examined by a committee of experts which would draft policy guidelines for the future

conduct of the trade in cultural property. As a first step a consultant has been engaged to:

(a) Determine whether it is possible and/or desirable to make it easier for collectors to acquire antiquities. This will include considering whether there is any problem in breaking up a collection whatever the collection, only some collections, or none; whether there are in fact great collections in reserves which could be made available and whether dealers would be interested in handling material of medium quality;

(b) Indicate how to distinguish recently discovered antiquities from those which have been in circulation for many years;

(c) Explain what is meant by the word "stolen" and whether it can also be applied to clandestine excavations where the antiquities are the property of the State, and to clarify the relationship between "theft" and "illegal export";

(d) Analyse to what extent dealers can police the trade;

(e) State in what areas cooperation between archaeologists and dealers could be envisaged.

29. In accordance with Recommendation 5.6, consultations are continuing with dealers on the proposed international code of ethics for further consideration at the next meeting of the Committee.

IV. PUBLIC INFORMATION

30. The secretariat continued to publicize the Committee's work by issuing press releases, taking part in news and current affairs programmes and maintaining numerous contacts with the media as a whole. The public was showing increasing concern regarding illicit trafficking; it was noted that the press file prepared for the eighth session had doubled in size over the previous session, indicating that there had been a very great increase in public interest.

31. ICOM gave a brief account of what ICOM was doing in the way of public information activities, citing the collection of publications entitled "One-hundred missing objects". The first issue, on Cambodia, had already proved very effective. ICOM argued for an increase in UNESCO's budget allocation to deal with illicit trafficking.

Notes

1/ The following States members of the Intergovernmental Committee took part in the eighth session: Angola, Bangladesh, Czech Republic, Sri Lanka, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Namibia, Nepal, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire.

2/ International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT).

3/ International Council of Museums (ICOM).

APPENDIX I

Recommendations adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee at its eighth session, held in Paris, France, from 24 to 27 May 1994

Recommendation No. 1

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,

Recalling that the United Nations General Assembly and the UNESCO General Conference have passed a series of resolutions concerning the return and restitution of cultural property,

Recalling that the Regional Workshop on the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property held in Jomtien, Thailand, from 24 to 28 February 1992, and the International Workshop on the Protection of Artistic and Cultural Patrimony held in Courmayeur, Italy, June 1992, recommended various measures to realize the objectives of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation, inter alia, an appeal to Member States, which have not yet ratified it to become parties to the UNESCO 1970 Convention and the establishment of a network of databases on illicit traffic in cultural property,

Also recalling that this Committee at its seventh session adopted a recommendation urging the UNESCO Secretariat to expand its cooperation with the United Nations in establishing databases on illicit traffic in cultural property,

Considering that in bilateral negotiations for the return and restitution of cultural property both parties' cooperation in exchanging prompt and accurate information on the property to be returned and restituted is essential for the successful conclusion of the negotiations,

1. Invites States Parties to the Convention to implement fully the provisions of the Convention and the aforementioned recommendations;

2. Urges Member States which have not yet ratified the Convention to become parties to it as soon as practicable;

3. Appeals to all Member States that they cooperate in exchanging information on the cultural objects to be returned or restituted;

4. Invites the Director-General to explore the possibilities of establishing a universal network of databases on cultural objects at the Secretariat;

5. Also invites the Director-General to take initiatives in implementing the Convention, such as:

(i) making a second appeal to Member States;

(ii) convening or encouraging international and regional conferences on the return and restitution of cultural property, as has already been done with the holding of the Arusha workshop in collaboration with ICOM in September 1993; and

(iii) examining ways of encouraging private owners to give public access to private collections of important cultural property;

(iv) also examining ways of encouraging private owners to treat cultural property in their possession in accordance with the norms of scientific conservation techniques.

Recommendation No. 2

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,

Recalling that Recommendation No. 2 of the Committee's seventh session:

(i) underlined the fact that the draft Convention of UNIDROIT (the International Institution for the Unification of Private Law) should be a useful addition to action under the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, 1970; and

(ii) stressed the need to ensure a link between the UNIDROIT draft and the UNESCO Convention;

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretariat (CLT-93/CONF.203/2 and 203/2 Add.) which informs the Committee of the elaboration of a draft UNIDROIT Convention on the international return of stolen or illegally exported cultural objects;

2. Invites the Director-General to bring the UNIDROIT draft to the attention of the members of UNESCO with the addition of a full analysis which would underline the complementarity between both texts and would indicate the differences which exist between the UNESCO Convention and the UNIDROIT draft;

3. Further invites the Director-General to study with UNIDROIT the distribution of the text of the draft in all the working languages of the Organization;

4. Renews its appeal to Member States to give full attention to every article of the UNIDROIT draft Convention and to make comments on these matters in order for them to be brought to the attention of the Member States prior to the meeting of the diplomatic conference which is anticipated for the discussion and possible adoption of the UNIDROIT draft.

Recommendation No. 3

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,

Conscious of the need to promote a policy of active cooperation which will reinforce the relations between those countries importing and those exporting cultural objects with the common aim of preserving universal cultural values,

Equally convinced that the preservation of the cultural identities of peoples is only possible by ensuring a close relationship between cultural objects and the environment which has produced them,

Noting that the 1970 Paris Convention establishes the legal structure to facilitate the restitution of stolen or illegally exported cultural objects,

Also noting that the draft UNIDROIT Convention would complement the above-mentioned Convention by facilitating its practical implementation,

Aware of the fact that often considerations of a financial character, especially for countries whose resources are limited, are obstacles which can (and sometimes do) prevent the restitution of such objects, in particular for the establishment of receiving institutions, and in respect of legal costs and transport,

Endorsing the Arusha Appeal of the ICOM/UNESCO Regional Workshop which desires the creation of an international fund, "to finance the acquisition of stolen property and its restitution to museums and communities when the national or international legislations do not provide for this",

1. Invites the Director-General to examine the possibility of establishing an international fund at UNESCO which would be financed by voluntary contributions, public and private, intended to facilitate the restitution of stolen or illicitly exported cultural objects, in cases where the countries concerned are unable to meet the related financial costs; and

2. Further invites the Director-General to report on this matter to the General Conference at its next session for the possible launching of an appeal to the international community to this effect.

Recommendation No. 4

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,

Endorsing the recommendations adopted at the International Workshop on the Protection of Artistic and Cultural Patrimony held in Courmayeur, Val d'Aoste, Italy, from 25 to 27 June 1992,

Taking into account Recommendation No. 1 (vii) which suggests that Governments should consider establishing regulations whereby any imported cultural object should be accompanied by an export permit issued by the relevant authorities of the country of origin,

Taking also into account Recommendation No. 1 (x) which envisages that the Director-General, in consultation with Governments and in cooperation with relevant organizations, should explore the possibility of creating an internationally recognized licensing system for art dealers, which would serve to weed out the criminal elements of an otherwise respectable professional group,

1. Invites the Director-General of UNESCO to prepare, if necessary in collaboration with international and regional intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, a document which would analyse all aspects of establishing an export permit issued by the competent authorities of the country of origin as well as the creation of an internationally recognized licensing system for art dealers; and

2. Further invites the Director-General to distribute this document to Member States before the meeting of the scheduled diplomatic conference for the discussion and possible adoption of the UNIDROIT draft Convention on the International Return of Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects.

Recommendation No. 5

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,

Referring to the "Feasibility of an International Code of Ethics for Dealers in Cultural Property for the Purpose of More Effective Control of Illicit Traffic in Cultural Property",

Convinced that cooperation of auctioneers, dealers and others involved in the buying and selling of cultural objects is essential for the control of illicit traffic in cultural property,

1. Invites States to encourage the adoption of a code of ethics by dealers in cultural objects or to ensure that they have legislation in place to regulate the activities of dealers together with those of conservators and restorers;

2. Invites States, where within a State dealers have adopted a code of ethics which includes provisions designed to prevent their participation in the illicit trade, to establish which dealers are not covered by the provisions of this code, and to adopt legislation regulating the behaviour of these dealers;

3. Invites States where within a State dealers have adopted a code of ethics, to give consideration to its enforceability, the adequacy of its provisions, its dissemination to all interested parties and generally

(e.g. through UNESCO) and access to some enforcement procedures on the part of parties aggrieved;

4. Invites States to consider the adoption, in concert with other States, of standard format export certificates;

5. Invites the Director-General to undertake specialized studies by archaeologists, conservators, architects, museum experts, dealers, cultural administrators and lawyers in order to clarify issues which are currently disputed or unclear and that such studies be examined by a committee of experts which would draft policy guidelines for the future conduct of the trade; and

6. Further invites the Director-General to include an item on an international code of ethics for dealers in the agenda of the ninth session of the Committee.

APPENDIX II

List of the 82 States parties to the Convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property

(Paris, 14 November 1970) as at 5 July 1995

State	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Algeria	24 June 1974 (R)	24 September 1974
Angola	7 November 1991 (R)	7 February 1992
Argentina	11 January 1973 (R)	11 April 1973
Armenia 1/	5 September 1993 (S)	Note 1
Australia	30 October 1989 (Ac)	30 January 1990
Bangladesh	9 December 1987 (R)	9 March 1988
Belarus	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
Belize	26 January 1990 (R)	26 April 1990
Bolivia	4 October 1976 (R)	4 January 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina 2/	12 July 1993 (S)	Note 2
Brazil	16 February 1973 (R)	16 May 1973
Bulgaria 7/	15 September 1971 (R)	24 April 1972
Burkina Faso	7 April 1987 (R)	7 July 1987
Cambodia	26 September 1972 (R)	26 December 1972
Cameroon	24 May 1972 (R)	24 August 1972
Canada	28 March 1978 (Ac)	28 June 1978
Central African Republic	1 February 1972 (R)	1 May 1972
China	28 November 1989 (Ac)	28 February 1990
Colombia	24 May 1988 (Ac)	24 August 1988
Côte d'Ivoire	30 October 1990 (R)	30 January 1991
Croatia 2/	6 July 1992 (S)	Note 2
Cuba	30 January 1980 (R)	30 April 1980
Cyprus	19 October 1979 (R)	19 January 1980
Czech Republic 3/	26 March 1993 (S)	Note 3
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	13 May 1983 (R)	13 August 1983

/...

State	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Dominican Republic	7 March 1973 (R)	7 June 1973
Ecuador 7/	24 March 1971 (A)	24 April 1972
Egypt	5 April 1973 (Ac)	5 July 1973
El Salvador	20 February 1978 (R)	20 May 1978
Georgia 1/	4 November 1992 (S)	Note 1
Greece	5 June 1981 (R)	5 September 1981
Grenada	10 September 1992 (Ac)	10 December 1992
Guatemala	14 January 1985 (R)	14 April 1985
Guinea	18 March 1979 (R)	18 June 1979
Honduras	19 March 1979 (R)	19 June 1979
Hungary	23 October 1978 (R)	23 January 1979
India	24 January 1977 (R)	24 April 1977
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 January 1975 (Ac)	27 April 1975
Iraq	12 February 1973 (Ac)	12 May 1973
Italy	2 October 1978	2 January 1979
Jordan	15 March 1974 (R)	15 June 1974
Kuwait	22 June 1972 (Ac)	22 September 1972
Kyrgyzstan	3 July 1995 (A)	3 October 1995 6/
Lebanon	25 August 1992 (R)	25 November 1992
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	9 January 1973 (R)	9 April 1973
Madagascar	21 June 1989 (R)	21 September 1989
Mali	6 April 1987 (R)	6 July 1987
Mauritania	27 April 1977 (R)	27 July 1977
Mauritius	27 February 1978 (Ac)	27 May 1978
Mexico	4 October 1972 (Ac)	4 January 1973
Mongolia	23 May 1991 (Ac)	23 August 1991
Nepal	23 June 1976 (R)	23 September 1976
Nicaragua	19 April 1977 (R)	19 July 1977
Niger	16 October 1972 (R)	16 January 1973

State	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Nigeria	24 January 1972 (R)	24 April 1972
Oman	2 June 1978 (Ac)	2 September 1978
Pakistan	30 April 1981 (R)	30 July 1981
Panama	13 August 1973 (Ac)	13 November 1973
Peru	24 October 1979 (Ac)	24 January 1980
Poland	31 January 1974 (R)	30 April 1974
Portugal	9 December 1985 (R)	9 March 1986
Qatar	20 April 1977 (Ac)	20 July 1977
Republic of Korea	14 February 1983 (Ac)	14 May 1983
Romania	6 December 1993 (R)	6 March 1994
Russian Federation 5/	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
Saudi Arabia	8 September 1976 (Ac)	8 December 1976
Senegal	9 December 1984 (R)	9 March 1985
Slovakia 3/	31 March 1993 (S)	Note 3
Slovenia 2/	5 November 1992 (S)	Note 2
Spain	10 January 1986 (R)	10 April 1986
Sri Lanka	7 April 1981 (Ac)	7 July 1981
Syrian Arab Republic	21 February 1975 (Ac)	21 May 1975
Tajikistan 1/	28 August 1992 (S)	Note 1
Tunisia	10 March 1975 (R)	10 June 1975
Turkey	21 April 1981 (R)	21 July 1981
Ukraine	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
United Republic of Tanzania	2 August 1977 (R)	2 November 1977
United States of America	2 September 1983 (Ac)	2 December 1983
Uruguay	9 August 1977 (R)	9 November 1977
Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) 4/	3 October 1972 (R)	3 January 1973
Zaire	23 September 1974 (R)	23 December 1974
Zambia	21 June 1985 (R)	21 September 1985

Notes

1/ This State lodged a notification of succession at the mentioned date, by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention that the USSR ratified on 28 April 1988.

2/ This State lodged a notification of succession at the mentioned date, by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention which Yugoslavia ratified on 3 October 1972.

3/ This State lodged a notification of succession at the mentioned date, by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention which Czechoslovakia accepted on 14 February 1977.

4/ The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) notified the Director-General on 27 April 1992 that it would strictly abide by all the international obligations which the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had assumed in the past.

5/ The instrument of ratification was deposited by the USSR on 28 April 1988. The Director-General has been informed that the Russian Federation would continue the participation of the USSR in UNESCO conventions.

6/ Date foreseen for entry into force.

7/ In conformity with the procedure set forth in the Convention, this agreement enters into force, for the first States, three months after the deposit of ratification by the third State, Nigeria.